

1

2 **CORRECTIVE SHOE SOLE STRUCTURES USING A CONTOUR**

3 **GREATER THAN THE THEORETICALLY IDEAL STABILITY PLANE**

4 *Just go'*

5 **BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION**

6 This invention relates generally to the structure of
7 shoes. More specifically, this invention relates to the structure
8 of running shoes. Still more particularly, this invention relates
9 to variations in the structure of such shoes having a sole contour
10 which follows a theoretically ideal stability plane as a basic
11 concept, but which deviates therefrom outwardly, to provide greater
12 than natural stability. Still more particularly, this invention
13 relates to the use of structures approximating, but increasing
14 beyond, a theoretically ideal stability plane to provide greater
15 than natural stability for an individual whose natural foot and
16 ankle biomechanical functioning have been degraded by a lifetime
17 use of flawed existing shoes.

18 Existing running shoes are unnecessarily unsafe. They
19 seriously disrupt natural human biomechanics. The resulting
20 unnatural foot and ankle motion leads to what are abnormally high
21 levels of running injuries.

22 Proof of the unnatural effect of shoes has come quite
23 unexpectedly from the discovery that, at the extreme end of its
24 normal range of motion, the unshod bare foot is naturally stable,
25 almost unsprainable, while the foot equipped with any shoe,
26 athletic or otherwise, is artificially unstable and abnormally
27 prone to ankle sprains. Consequently, ordinary ankle sprains must
28 be viewed as largely an unnatural phenomena, even though fairly
29 common. Compelling evidence demonstrates that the stability of
30 bare feet is entirely different from the stability of shoe-equipped
31 feet.

1 The underlying cause of the universal instability of
2 shoes is a critical but correctable design flaw. That hidden flaw,
3 so deeply ingrained in existing shoe designs, is so extraordinarily
4 fundamental that it has remained unnoticed until now. The flaw is
5 revealed by a novel new biomechanical test, one that is
6 unprecedented in its simplicity. The test simulates a lateral
7 ankle sprain while standing stationary. It is easy enough to be
8 duplicated and verified by anyone; it only takes a few minutes and
9 requires no scientific equipment or expertise.

10 The simplicity of the test belies its surprisingly convincing
11 results. It demonstrates an obvious difference in stability
12 between a bare foot and a running shoe, a difference so
13 unexpectedly huge that it makes an apparently subjective test
14 clearly objective instead. The test proves beyond doubt that all
15 existing shoes are unsafely unstable.

16 The broader implications of this uniquely unambiguous
17 discovery are potentially far-reaching. The same fundamental flaw
18 in existing shoes that is glaringly exposed by the new test also
19 appears to be the major cause of chronic overuse injuries, which
20 are unusually common in running, as well as other sport injuries.
21 It causes the chronic injuries in the same way it causes ankle
22 sprains; that is, by seriously disrupting natural foot and ankle
23 biomechanics.

24 The applicant has introduced into the art the concept of a
25 theoretically ideal stability plane as a structural basis for shoe
26 sole designs. That concept as implemented into shoes such as
27 street-shoes and athletic shoes is presented in pending U.S.
28 applications Nos. 07/219,387, filed on July 15, 1988; 07/239,667,
29 filed on September 2, 1988; and 07/400,714, filed on August 30,
30 1989, as well as in PCT Application No. PCT/US89/03076 filed on
31 July 14, 1989. The purpose of the theoretically ideal stability
32 plane as described in these applications was primarily to provide

1 a neutral design that allows for natural foot and ankle
2 biomechanics as close as possible to that between the foot and the
3 ground, and to avoid the serious interference with natural foot and
4 ankle biomechanics inherent in existing shoes.

5 This new invention is a modification of the inventions
6 disclosed and claimed in the earlier application and develops the
7 application of the concept of the theoretically ideal stability
8 plane to other shoe structures. As such, it presents certain
9 structural ideas which deviate outwardly from the theoretically
10 ideal stability plane to compensate for faulty foot biomechanics
11 caused by the major flaw in existing shoe designs identified in the
12 earlier patent applications.

13 The shoe sole designs in this application are based on a
14 recognition that lifetime use of existing shoes, the unnatural
15 design of which is innately and seriously flawed, has produced
16 actual structural changes in the human foot and ankle. Existing
17 shoes thereby have altered natural human biomechanics in many, if
18 not most, individuals to an extent that must be compensated for in
19 an enhanced and therapeutic design. The continual repetition of
20 serious interference by existing shoes appears to have produced
21 individual biomechanical changes that may be permanent, so simply
22 removing the cause is not enough. Treating the residual effect
23 must also be undertaken.

24 Accordingly, it is a general object of this invention to
25 elaborate upon the application of the principle of the
26 theoretically ideal stability plane to other shoe structures.

27 It is still another object of this invention to provide a shoe
28 having a sole contour which deviates outwardly in a constructive
29 way from the theoretically ideal stability plane.

30 It is another object of this invention to provide a sole
31 contour having a shape naturally contoured to the shape of a human
32 foot, but having a shoe sole thickness which is increases somewhat

1 beyond the thickness specified by the theoretically ideal stability
2 plane.

3 It is another object of this invention to provide a naturally
4 contoured shoe sole having a thickness somewhat greater than
5 mandated by the concept of a theoretically ideal stability plane,
6 either through most of the contour of the sole, or a preselected
7 portions of the sole.

8 It is yet another object of this invention to provide a
9 naturally contoured shoe sole having a thickness which approximates
10 a theoretically ideal stability plane, but which varies toward
11 either a greater thickness throughout the sole or at spaced
12 portions thereof, or toward a similar but lesser thickness.

13 These and other objects of the invention will become apparent
14 from a detailed description of the invention which follows taken
15 with the accompanying drawings.

16

17 BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

18 Directed to achieving the aforementioned objects and to
19 overcoming problems with prior art shoes, a shoe according to the
20 invention comprises a sole having at least a portion thereof
21 following approximately the contour of a theoretically ideal
22 stability plane, preferably applied to a naturally contoured shoe
23 sole approximating the contour of a human foot.

24 In another aspect, the shoe includes a naturally contoured
25 sole structure exhibiting natural deformation which closely
26 parallels the natural deformation of a foot under the same load,
27 and having a contour which approximates, but increases beyond the
28 theoretically ideal stability plane. When the shoe sole thickness
29 is increased beyond the theoretically ideal stability plane,
30 greater than natural stability results; when thickness is
31 decreased, greater than natural motion results.

32 In a preferred embodiment, such variations are consistent

1 through all frontal plane cross sections so that there are
2 proportionally equal increases to the theoretically ideal stability
3 plane from front to back. In alternative embodiments, the
4 thickness may increase, then decrease at respective adjacent
5 locations, or vary in other thickness sequences.

6 The thickness variations may be symmetrical on both sides, or
7 asymmetrical, particularly since it may be desirable to provide
8 greater stability for the medial side than the lateral side to
9 compensate for common pronation problems. The variation pattern
10 of the right shoe can vary from that of the left shoe. Variation
11 in shoe sole density or bottom sole tread can also provide reduced
12 but similar effects.

13 These and other features of the invention will become apparent
14 from the detailed description of the invention which follows.
15

16 BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE DRAWINGS

17 Fig. 1 shows, in frontal plane cross section at the heel
18 portion of a shoe, the applicant's prior invention of a shoe sole
19 with naturally contoured sides based on a theoretically ideal
20 stability plane.

21 Fig. 2 shows, again in frontal plane cross section, the most
22 general case of the applicant's prior invention, a fully contoured
23 shoe sole that follows the natural contour of the bottom of the
24 foot as well as its sides, also based on the theoretically ideal
25 stability plane.

26 Fig. 3, as seen in FIGS 3A to 3C in frontal plane cross
27 section at the heel, shows the applicant's prior invention for
28 conventional shoes, a quadrant-sided shoe sole, based on a
29 theoretically ideal stability plane.

30 Fig. 4 shows a frontal plane cross section at the heel portion
31 of a shoe with naturally contoured sides like those of Fig. 1,
32 wherein a portion of the shoe sole thickness is increased beyond

1 the theoretically ideal stability plane.

2 Fig. 5 is a view similar to Fig. 4, but of a shoe with fully
3 contoured sides wherein the sole thickness increases with
4 increasing distance from the center line of the ground-engaging
5 portion of the sole.

6 Fig. 6 is a view similar to Fig. 5 where the fully contoured
7 sole thickness variations are continually increasing on each side.

8 Fig. 7 is a view similar to Figs. 4 to 6 wherein the sole
9 thicknesses vary in diverse sequences.

10 Fig. 8 is a frontal plane cross section showing a density
11 variation in the midsole.

12 Fig. 9 is a view similar to Fig. 8 wherein the firmest density
13 material is at the outermost edge of the midsole contour.

14 Fig. 10 is a view similar to Figs. 8 and 9 showing still
15 another density variation, one which is asymmetrical.

16 Fig. 11 shows a variation in the thickness of the sole for the
17 quadrant embodiment which is greater than a theoretically ideal
18 stability plane.

19 Fig. 12 shows a quadrant embodiment as in Fig. 11 wherein the
20 density of the sole varies.

21 Fig. 13 shows a bottom sole tread design that provides a
22 similar density variation as that in Fig. 10.

23 Fig. 14 shows embodiments like Figs. 1 through 3 but wherein
24 a portion of the shoe sole thickness is decreased to less than the
25 theoretically ideal stability plane.

26 Fig. 15 shows embodiments with sides both greater and lesser
27 than the theoretically ideal stability plane.

29 DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE PREFERRED EMBODIMENTS

30 Figs. 1, 2, and 3 show frontal plane cross sectional views of
31 a shoe sole according to the applicant's prior inventions based on
32 the theoretically ideal stability plane, taken at about the ankle

1 joint to show the heel section of the shoe. Figs. 4 through 13
2 show the same view of the applicant's enhancement of that
3 invention. The reference numerals are like those used in the prior
4 pending applications of the applicant mentioned above and which are
5 incorporated by reference for the sake of completeness of
6 disclosure, if necessary. In the figures, a foot 27 is positioned
7 in a naturally contoured shoe having an upper 21 and a sole 28.
8 The shoe sole normally contacts the ground 43 at about the lower
9 central heel portion thereof, as shown in Fig 4. The concept of
10 the theoretically ideal stability plane, as developed in the prior
11 applications as noted, defines the plane 51 in terms of a locus of
12 points determined by the thickness (s) of the sole.

13 Fig. 1 shows, in a rear cross sectional view, the application
14 of the prior invention showing the inner surface of the shoe sole
15 conforming to the natural contour of the foot and the thickness of
16 the shoe sole remaining constant in the frontal plane, so that the
17 outer surface coincides with the theoretically ideal stability
18 plane.

19 Fig. 2 shows a fully contoured shoe sole design of the
20 applicant's prior invention that follows the natural contour of all
21 of the foot, the bottom as well as the sides, while retaining a
22 constant shoe sole thickness in the frontal plane.

23 The fully contoured shoe sole assumes that the resulting
24 slightly rounded bottom when unloaded will deform under load and
25 flatten just as the human foot bottom is slightly rounded unloaded
26 but flattens under load; therefore, shoe sole material must be of
27 such composition as to allow the natural deformation following that
28 of the foot. The design applies particularly to the heel, but to
29 the rest of the shoe sole as well. By providing the closest match
30 to the natural shape of the foot, the fully contoured design allows
31 the foot to function as naturally as possible. Under load, Fig.
32 2 would deform by flattening to look essentially like Fig. 1. Seen

1 in this light, the naturally contoured side design in Fig. 1 is a
2 more conventional, conservative design that is a special case of
3 the more general fully contoured design in Fig. 2, which is the
4 closest to the natural form of the foot, but the least
5 conventional. The amount of deformation flattening used in the
6 Fig. 1 design, which obviously varies under different loads, is not
7 an essential element of the applicant's invention.

8 Figs. 1 and 2 both show in frontal plane cross sections the
9 essential concept underlying this invention, the theoretically
10 ideal stability plane, which is also theoretically ideal for
11 efficient natural motion of all kinds, including running, jogging
12 or walking. Fig. 2 shows the most general case of the invention,
13 the fully contoured design, which conforms to the natural shape of
14 the unloaded foot. For any given individual, the theoretically
15 ideal stability plane 51 is determined, first, by the desired shoe
16 sole thickness (s) in a frontal plane cross section, and, second,
17 by the natural shape of the individual's foot surface 29.

18 For the special case shown in Fig. 1, the theoretically ideal
19 stability plane for any particular individual (or size average of
20 individuals) is determined, first, by the given frontal plane cross
21 section shoe sole thickness (s); second, by the natural shape of
22 the individual's foot; and, third, by the frontal plane cross
23 section width of the individual's load-bearing footprint 30b, which
24 is defined as the upper surface of the shoe sole that is in
25 physical contact with and supports the human foot sole.

26 The theoretically ideal stability plane for the special case
27 is composed conceptually of two parts. Shown in Fig. 1, the first
28 part is a line segment 31b of equal length and parallel to line 30b
29 at a constant distance (s) equal to shoe sole thickness. This
30 corresponds to a conventional shoe sole directly underneath the
31 human foot, and also corresponds to the flattened portion of the
32 bottom of the load-bearing foot sole 28b. The second part is the

1 naturally contoured stability side outer edge 31a located at each
2 side of the first part, line segment 31b. Each point on the
3 contoured side outer edge 31a is located at a distance which is
4 exactly shoe sole thickness (s) from the closest point on the
5 contoured side inner edge 30a.

6 In summary, the theoretically ideal stability plane is the
7 essence of this invention because it is used to determine a
8 geometrically precise bottom contour of the shoe sole based on a
9 top contour that conforms to the contour of the foot. This
10 invention specifically claims the exactly determined geometric
11 relationship just described.

12 It can be stated unequivocally that any shoe sole
13 contour, even of similar contour, that exceeds the theoretically
14 ideal stability plane will restrict natural foot motion, while any
15 less than that plane will degrade natural stability, in direct
16 proportion to the amount of the deviation. The theoretical ideal
17 was taken to be that which is closest to natural.

18 Fig. 3 illustrates in frontal plane cross section another
19 variation of the applicant's prior invention that uses stabilizing
20 quadrants 26 at the outer edge of a conventional shoe sole 28b
21 illustrated generally at the reference numeral 28. The stabilizing
22 quadrants would be abbreviated in actual embodiments.

23 Fig. 4 illustrates the applicant's new invention of shoe sole
24 side thickness increasing beyond the theoretically ideal stability
25 plane to increase stability somewhat beyond its natural level.
26 The unavoidable trade-off resulting is that natural motion would
27 be restricted somewhat and the weight of the shoe sole would
28 increase somewhat.

29 Fig. 4 shows a situation wherein the thickness of the sole at
30 each of the opposed sides is thicker at the portions of the sole
31 31a by a thickness which gradually varies continuously from a
32 thickness (s) through a thickness (s+s1), to a thickness (s+s2).

1 These designs recognize that lifetime use of existing shoes,
2 the design of which has an inherent flaw that continually disrupts
3 natural human biomechanics, has produced thereby actual structural
4 changes in a human foot and ankle to an extent that must be
5 compensated for. Specifically, one of the most common of the
6 abnormal effects of the inherent existing flaw is a weakening of
7 the long arch of the foot, increasing pronation. These designs
8 therefore modify the applicant's preceding designs to provide
9 greater than natural stability and should be particularly useful
10 to individuals, generally with low arches, prone to pronate
11 excessively, and could be used only on the medial side. Similarly,
12 individuals with high arches and a tendency to over supinate and
13 lateral ankle sprains would also benefit, and the design could be
14 used only on the lateral side. A shoe for the general population
15 that compensates for both weaknesses in the same shoe would
16 incorporate the enhanced stability of the design compensation on
17 both sides.

18 The new design in Fig. 4, like Figs. 1 and 2, allows the shoe
19 sole to deform naturally closely paralleling the natural
20 deformation of the barefoot underload; in addition, shoe sole
21 material must be of such composition as to allow the natural
22 deformation following that of the foot.

23 The new designs retain the essential novel aspect of the
24 earlier designs; namely, contouring the shape of the shoe sole to
25 the shape of the human foot. The difference is that the shoe sole
26 thickness in the frontal plane is allowed to vary rather than
27 remain uniformly constant. More specifically, Figs. 4, 5, 6, 7,
28 and 11 show, in frontal plane cross sections at the heel, that the
29 shoe sole thickness can increase beyond the theoretically ideal
30 stability plane 51, in order to provide greater than natural
31 stability. Such variations (and the following variations) can be
32 consistent through all frontal plane cross sections, so that there

1 are proportionately equal increases to the theoretically ideal
2 stability plane 51 from the front of the shoe sole to the back, or
3 that the thickness can vary, preferably continuously, from one
4 frontal plane to the next.

5 The exact amount of the increase in shoe sole thickness beyond
6 the theoretically ideal stability plane is to be determined
7 empirically. Ideally, right and left shoe soles would be custom
8 designed for each individual based on an biomechanical analysis of
9 the extent of his or her foot and ankle dysfunction in order to
10 provide an optimal individual correction. If epidemiological
11 studies indicate general corrective patterns for specific
12 categories of individuals or the population as a whole, then mass-
13 produced corrective shoes with soles incorporating contoured sides
14 exceeding the theoretically ideal stability plane would be
15 possible. It is expected that any such mass-produced corrective
16 shoes for the general population would have thicknesses exceeding
17 the theoretically ideal stability plane by an amount up to 5 or 10
18 percent, while more specific groups or individuals with more severe
19 dysfunction could have an empirically demonstrated need for greater
20 corrective thicknesses on the order of up to 25 percent more than
21 the theoretically ideal stability plane. The optimal contour for
22 the increased thickness may also be determined empirically.

23 Fig. 5 shows a variation of the enhanced fully contoured
24 design wherein the shoe sole begins to thicken beyond the
25 theoretically ideal stability plane 51 somewhat offset to the
26 sides.

27 Fig. 6 shows a thickness variation which is symmetrical as in
28 the case of Fig. 4 and 5, but wherein the shoe sole begins to
29 thicken beyond the theoretically ideal stability plane 51 directly
30 underneath the foot heel 27 on about a center line of the shoe
31 sole. In fact, in this case the thickness of the shoe sole is the
32 same as the theoretically ideal stability plane only at that

1 beginning point underneath the upright foot. For the applicant's
2 new invention where the shoe sole thickness varies, the
3 theoretically ideal stability plane is determined by the least
4 thickness in the shoe sole's direct load-bearing portion meaning
5 that portion with direct tread contact on the ground; the outer
6 edge or periphery of the shoe sole is obviously excluded, since the
7 thickness there always decreases to zero. Note that the capability
8 to deform naturally of the applicant's design may make some
9 portions of the shoe sole load-bearing when they are actually under
10 a load, especially walking or running, even though they might not
11 appear to be when not under a load.

12 Fig. 7 shows that the thickness can also increase and then
13 decrease; other thickness variation sequences are also possible.
14 The variation in side contour thickness in the new invention can
15 be either symmetrical on both sides or asymmetrical, particularly
16 with the medial side providing more stability than the lateral
17 side, although many other asymmetrical variations are possible, and
18 the pattern of the right foot can vary from that of the left foot.

19 Figs. 8, 9, 10 and 12 show that similar variations in shoe
20 midsole (other portions of the shoe sole area not shown) density
21 can provide similar but reduced effects to the variations in shoe
22 sole thickness described previously in Figs. 4 through 7. The
23 major advantage of this approach is that the structural
24 theoretically ideal stability plane is retained, so that naturally
25 optimal stability and efficient motion are retained to the maximum
26 extent possible.

27 The forms of dual and tri-density midsoles shown in the
28 figures are extremely common in the current art of running shoes,
29 and any number of densities are theoretically possible, although
30 an angled alternation of just two densities like that shown in Fig.
31 8 provides continually changing composite density. However, the
32 applicant's prior invention did not prefer multi-densities in the

1 midsole, since only a uniform density provides a neutral shoe sole
2 design that does not interfere with natural foot and ankle
3 biomechanics in the way that multi-density shoe soles do, which is
4 by providing different amounts of support to different parts of the
5 foot; it did not, of course, preclude such multi-density midsoles.
6 In these figures, the density of the sole material designated by
7 the legend (d1) is firmer than (d) while (d2) is the firmest of the
8 three representative densities shown. In Fig. 8, a dual density
9 sole is shown, with (d) having the less firm density.

10 It should be noted that shoe soles using a combination both
11 of sole thicknesses greater than the theoretically ideal stability
12 plane and of midsole densities variations like those just described
13 are also possible but not shown.

14 Fig. 13 shows a bottom sole tread design that provides about
15 the same overall shoe sole density variation as that provided in
16 Fig. 10 by midsole density variation. The less supporting tread
17 there is under any particular portion of the shoe sole, the less
18 effective overall shoe sole density there is, since the midsole
19 above that portion will deform more easily than if it were fully
20 supported.

21 Fig. 14 shows embodiments like those in Figs. 4 through 13 but
22 wherein a portion of the shoe sole thickness is decreased to less
23 than the theoretically ideal stability plane. It is anticipated
24 that some individuals with foot and ankle biomechanics that have
25 been degraded by existing shoes may benefit from such embodiments,
26 which would provide less than natural stability but greater freedom
27 of motion, and less shoe sole weight add bulk. In particular, it
28 is anticipated that individuals with overly rigid feet, those with
29 restricted range of motion, and those tending to over-supinate may
30 benefit from the Fig. 14 embodiments. Even more particularly, it
31 is expected that the invention will benefit individuals with
32 significant bilateral foot function asymmetry: namely, a tendency

1 toward pronation on one foot and supination on the other foot.
2 Consequently, it is anticipated that this embodiment would be used
3 only on the shoe sole of the supinating foot, and on the inside
4 portion only, possibly only a portion thereof. It is expected that
5 the range less than the theoretically ideal stability plane would
6 be a maximum of about five to ten percent, though a maximum of up
7 to twenty-five percent may be beneficial to some individuals.

8 Fig. 14A shows an embodiment like Figs. 4 and 7, but with
9 naturally contoured sides less than the theoretically ideal
10 stability plane. Fig. 14B shows an embodiment like the fully
11 contoured design in Figs. 5 and 6, but with a shoe sole thickness
12 decreasing with increasing distance from the center portion of the
13 sole. Fig. 14C shows an embodiment like the quadrant-sided design
14 of Fig. 11, but with the quadrant sides increasingly reduced from
15 the theoretically ideal stability plane.

16 The lesser-sided design of Fig. 14 would also apply to the
17 Figs. 8 through 10 and 12 density variation approach and to the
18 Fig. 13 approach using tread design to approximate density
19 variation.

20 Fig. 15 A-C show, in cross sections similar to those in
21 pending U.S. application No. 07/219,387, that with the quadrant-
22 sided design of Figs. 3, 11, 12 and 14C that it is possible to have
23 shoe sole sides that are both greater and lesser than the
24 theoretically ideal stability plane in the same shoe. The radius
25 of an intermediate shoe sole thickness, taken at (S^2) at the base
26 of the fifth metatarsal in Fig. 15B, is maintained constant
27 throughout the quadrant sides of the shoe sole, including both the
28 heel, Fig. 15C, and the forefoot, Fig. 15A, so that the side
29 thickness is less than the theoretically ideal stability plane at
30 the heel and more at the forefoot. Though possible, this is not
31 a preferred approach.

32 The same approach can be applied to the naturally contoured

1 sides or fully contoured designs described in Figs. 1, 2, 4 through
2 10 and 13, but it is also not preferred. In addition, as shown in
3 Figs. 15 D-F, in cross sections similar to those in pending U.S.
4 application No. 07/239,667, it is possible to have shoe sole sides
5 that are both greater and lesser than the theoretically ideal
6 stability plane in the same shoe, like Figs. 15A-C, but wherein the
7 side thickness (or radius) is neither constant like Figs 15A-C or
8 varying directly with shoe sole thickness, like in the applicant's
9 pending applications, but instead varying quite indirectly with
10 shoe sole thickness. As shown in Figs 15D-F, the shoe sole side
11 thickness varies from somewhat less than shoe sole thickness at the
12 heel to somewhat more at the forefoot. This approach, though
13 possible, is again not preferred, and can be applied to the
14 quadrant sided design, but is not preferred there either.

15 The foregoing shoe designs meet the objectives of this
16 invention as stated above. However, it will clearly be understood
17 by those skilled in the art that the foregoing description has been
18 made in terms of the preferred embodiments and various changes and
19 modifications may be made without departing from the scope of the
20 present invention which is to be defined by the appended claims.